

# Utah State Building Board



## BUSINESS MEETING AND PRIORITIZATION

October 3, 2019

---

### **MINUTES**

#### **Members in Attendance:**

Joseph Burgess, Chair  
Stan Plewe  
William French  
Lisa Barrager  
Wendell Morse  
Kevin VanTassell  
Miranda Jones Cox  
Richard Fairbanks

#### **Guests in Attendance:**

Jeff Reddoor	Utah State Building Board
Mike Kelley	Assistant Attorney General
Jim Russell	DFCM
Matt Boyer	DFCM
Jake Njord	DFCM
Cee Cee Niederhauser	DFCM
Ben Berrett	Utah State University
Malin Francis	Salt Lake Community College
David Woolstenhulme	USHE
Rich Amon	USHE
Scott L. Wyatt	Southern Utah University
Chris Talbot	State Courts
Eliot Wilcox	University of Utah
Peter Trapa	University of Utah
Kristy Rigby	Department of Public Safety
Mike Rapich	Department of Public Safety
Tani Downing	Department of Administrative Services
Dan Clark	State Parks
Marvin Dodge	Southern Utah University
Bruce Daley	Weber State University
Charles Goodman	USDC

Frank Rees	USDC
Bret Hardy	USDC
Tyson Walker	Human Services
Erin West	Spectrum Engineers
Kim Johnson	Design West Architects
Eric Isom	MIB Partners
Tyler Brinkerhoff	UTEC

On Thursday, October 3, 2015 the Utah State Building Board held a Business Meeting and the Prioritization for FY 2021 State Funded Projects in Room 4112 Utah State Office Building, Capitol Hill Complex, Salt Lake City, Utah. Building Board Chair Joe Burgess called the meeting to order at 8:30 am.

#### **❑ DISCUSSIONS ON FY 2021 STATE FUNDED CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND LAND BANKING PROJECTS**

Chair Burgess announced the Board would like to hear additional information on some of the projects presented at yesterday's FY 2021 State Funded Capital Development Hearing.

Miranda Jones-Cox representing the Governor's Office of Management and Budget reported that it's too early to tell where revenues will be this early in the process. The GOMB does agree with the rank and prioritization of the Board of Regents and UTEC. In addition, they believe the two agencies with the greatest needs are the Developmental Center and the Manti Courthouse. The GOMB is looking forward to reviewing the Building Board's recommendation and prioritization today.

Dan Clark from State Parks returned to the Board to clarify that he checked records for the property for the proposed campground and it really is 50 acres requested for Quail Creek and not 22 acres as had been previously reported. Scott Strong, Deputy Director over Finance for State Parks was present at the meeting to answer any budget or finance questions on the Parks project. There were previous questions concerning the project funding and how much would be generated from the cottages and the improved campground. If O&M is not calculated as an expense in the total, then revenues would double the investment over 30 years from this project. Mr. Strong noted that based on those numbers, Parks could fund the O&M internally and will retract the \$100,000 O&M request attached to this project. They anticipate this campground will generate approximately \$300,000 a year. Jeff Reddoor instructed Board members to please make the corrections in their funding spreadsheet and added that the retraction of O&M is a significant cost advantage for this project. It was noted that sewers are really difficult in a campground, so a dump station will be installed. Water and power will also be added.

Mike Rapich from Public Safety also returned to answer additional questions from the Board. First, Mr. Rapich clarified that access to the roadway is part of the project. Partial access is on 1400 South. Perry City's master plan also shows the accesses to the property on their master plan. This opens up access to development for the city as well. Perry City is verbally committed to the project and they are waiting to see how we progress before moving forward.

Even if this doesn't happen quickly the project will still have access on 450 West. Jeff Reddoor asked questions about the various colors on the map and if it would require additional land purchases. Mr. Rapich indicated there are private land issues that are presently being worked on.

Kevin VanTassell asked for additional information from USDC. He questioned Dr. Rees as to whether the USDC project is inadequate. Shouldn't USDC provide breezeways or covered walks as part of this project? Tyson Walker indicated that the fire code aspect of this has been reviewed. There is the possibility of an added breezeway to the one building that is closest to the new facility. Fire code issues would have to be addressed. Jeff Reddoor requested that DFCM provide an alternate project that has covered sidewalks and have this be an option for the project. Hopefully this could be accomplished before the Legislative session begins. There were questions concerning the master plan, the age of some of the buildings and how many buildings on campus were in need of demolition. The Board felt there was such a great need on the campus when they visited this facility last year.

Mr. Van Tassell indicated that there was a \$250,000 request for additional O&M on this project and questioned whether additional O&M would be needed after the old buildings were razed or consolidated. Jeff Reddoor asked USDC how their O&M was calculated. If no buildings were being removed then it is the straight O&M calculation based on the number of square feet.

Chair Burgess also referred to the discussion concerning multiple therapy pools at the new facility. Dr. Rees indicated that with funding there may be the possibility of a pool repair in the old facility which would allow USDC to keep both pools operational and provide an alternative on days when there are sanitation concerns. Lisa Barrager was familiar with pool construction and advised USDC that a pool sanitation issue in a new pool could be dealt with in 30 minutes with the new technology. It was noted that the present therapy pool had 104 days where the pool was down which included maintenance and incidence problems with sanitation. Jeff Reddoor commented that with Capital Improvement Funding, there is the possibility that USDC could address some of these issues with the pool and keep both pools operational.

Jeff Reddoor reported that he did not see an email with the updated O&M costs from USDC. Mr. Walker said it had been sent and that it was just over \$300,000.

Dr. Rees commented that USDC is very open to the concept of covered parkways for their facility which would be appreciated in inclement weather.

There were questions concerning Whirling's Disease. Roger Mellenthin with the Division of Wildlife Resources addressed this since this can be an issue. There are barriers that can be put in place and a more sophisticated way to deal with the settled solid wastes from fish and New Zealand Mud Snails from coming up into the pond.

#### **❑ PRESENTATION OF DFCM'S PRIORITIZATION**

DFCM Director Jim Russell and Matt Boyer, Assistant Director explained their prioritization of projects and referred to the Excel Spreadsheet distributed to the Board. Mr. Russell mentioned

that the changes to the prioritization process this year are a response to the Legislative audit. These changes have been accepted by the auditors and the Executive Appropriation Committee with additional ideas coming forth from the Legislature in the future. Hopefully, next year the process will be clarified and improved with additional feedback. One of the items identified in the audit is the idea that if we can collect better data earlier in the process; then we can make better decisions. DFCM agreed to work with the institutions and agencies so that prior to August, DFCM could accumulate all the information for Board of Regents and UTEC, in order to make better decisions. Some of the changes include:

1. Develop a standard for the Needs Statement which will help in the development of the Capital Budget Estimate.
2. Space Utilization Standards will be used in the future. USHE, UTECH and State Agencies will have individual standards for their entity
3. Identifying a Scope Statement provided by DFCM which will include a disclosure of all areas of the scope so there is more transparency.

Mr. Russell also clarified that because of time constraints and other concerns, this year's ranking is not a prioritization. As DFCM reviewed the projects, because of time constraints, they discovered it was a little late to request additional information from the entity. This created problems with projects that may have a higher need but did not score as high as they should have. Mr. Russell complimented Dr. Amon and the new methods of prioritizations used by USHE. DFCM is trying to provide a quantitative analysis which is quite different than scoring things qualitatively. Three individuals from DFCM reviewed the projects to provide the rankings.

Mr. Russell clarified the scoring criteria:

1. Renovation or Re-Use -- If the project is entirely new space then no points were awarded. If moving to a new space which alleviates life safety and ADA issues, then you received 3 points
2. Removal of a bad building out of the mix; then you received 5 points. Ninety percent of public safety was moving to new space from a leased space so they were given points for this.
3. Space Utilization and Need – Used the Higher Ed standard for this.

Miranda Cox Jones suggested that this be separated in the future and does not see any correlation between space utilization and need. This will be address in the future.

4. Cost Efficiency – There were 3 subcategories
  - Feasibility Study - it was pass/fail – either 0 or 5
  - Cost Effectiveness
  - Efficiency in the Design – consolidation in spaces or services which makes the project more efficient.

There were concerns about the absence of a Feasibility Study and how that affects the cost effectiveness of a project.

5. Alternate Funding – projects that have additional funds not appropriations from the Legislature – 5 points if you had it and 0 if you didn't.

There were concerns about how Higher Ed can receive donations and agencies cannot which creates a disadvantage. There were also questions about how opportunity for revenues such as with State Parks would affect the project. How could funding be clarified or sure? There was

an explanation concerning the funding commitment letter which is submitted to the Board. There were concerns that the commitment letter should be in place prior to the ranking. Should this be part of the ranking process? Can a private donor change the state priority? Higher Ed reported that they look at only what is currently on hand and not the potential for fund raising for the project. Miranda Jones-Cox felt that donations and other funds should not be used as ranking criteria. Jim Russell indicated that this component does sway who will get the number one and two spots. It was noted that the number of competitive projects that come forward from Higher Ed will be significantly reduced as their system of ranking is used in the future

#### **❑ QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

There were concerns about the scoring for the USDC Therapy Building. Mr. Russell clarified that the Therapy Building received no points on category 1 where they could have received 5 points if they had agreed to demolish the old building as part of the project. Mr. Russell felt the old Rec Center should be demolished and taken away. The demo is not part of the original project even though they were planning to do this in the future. Representatives understood this should have been included in the project and asked that this be considered in the Board's scoring. USDC clarified that they have Capital Improvement funding to remove the electrical from the old building prior to demolition so that when the building is demolished in the future, it will not affect the transformers all over campus. Although encouraged to do so, they did not commit to demolishing the old building as part of their FY21 Capital Development project.

**Modifications** – The O&M for the USDC Therapies Building O&M was changed to \$301,039.00

The question was asked that when a project is completed, is there a re-evaluation on the O&M based again on completed project square footage. LFA could make an adjustment at the completion of the building if needed. This is done through a performance audit with DFCM.

#### **❑ ADJOURNMENT: BREAK AWAY SECTION FOR INDIVIDUAL SCORING**

Board members relocated to areas to do individual scoring. The scores were tallied by the Building Board Director.

#### **❑ DISCUSSION AND VOTING ON FY2021 STATE FUNDED CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND LAND BANKING FINAL PRIORITIZATION**

The meeting reconvened at 11:25 pm for discussion and voting. Jeff Reddoor distributed copies of the combined score sheets which indicated rankings for each project. The floor was opened for discussion. Jeff Reddoor asked the Board to determine if the present compiled scores reflect the Board's desire for the final ranking. Dixie State's Land Bank project should be scored as a yes or no.

When the Board returned, Chair Burgess asked if there was any discussion on the final ranking. Jeff Reddoor distributed the prioritization list and read the ranking to those in attendance. Kevin VanTassell expressed appreciation to all the institutions and agencies for their projects. He indicated it was a difficult decision because of the quality of the projects coming forward.

Wendell Morse said that USDC would be his number one project if there were more direction. He would like to see an updating to the Master Plan and more building consolidation in the future.

**Utah State Building Board  
FY 2021 Capital Development - State Funded Projects  
Scoring Sheet**

Agency / Institution	Project Name	State Funding Request	Other Funding	Total Project Amount	Totals	Priority
Bridgerland Technical College (BTECH)	Health Science And Technology Building	\$ 38,059,576	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 39,059,576	10	1
Southern Utah University	Academic Classroom Building	\$ 43,013,748	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 45,013,748	12	2
State Courts	Sixth District Courthouse Sanpete County Manti	\$ 19,597,906	\$ 1,070,655	\$ 20,668,561	26	3
Public Safety	Brigham City DPS Consolidated Building	\$ 7,525,678	\$ 2,050,000	\$ 9,575,678	32	4
Department of Natural Resources - Fire	Richfield Cache Building	\$ 2,363,806	\$ -	\$ 2,363,806	33	5
University of Utah	Applied Science Building	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 24,560,663	\$ 84,560,663	48	6
Division of State Parks	Quail Creek New Campground	\$ 5,209,244	\$ -	\$ 5,209,244	54	7
Division of Wildlife Resources	Loa Fish Hatchery	\$ 33,892,166	\$ -	\$ 33,892,166	56	8
Department Of Human Services / USDC	Therapy Building	\$ 17,568,755	\$ -	\$ 17,568,755	57	9
Utah State University	Mehdi Heravi Global Teaching and Learning Center	\$ 14,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 17,000,000	59	10
Mountainland Technical College (MTECH)	Payson Campus	\$ 46,215,079	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 50,715,079	75	11
Dixie State University LAND BANK	LAND BANK	\$ 10,075,000	\$ -	\$ 10,075,000		
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$ 298,020,958</b>	<b>\$ 37,681,318</b>	<b>\$ 335,702,276</b>		
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$ 335,702,276</b>				

Chair Burgess asked for a motion to approve the FY2021 Capital Development Prioritization and Land Bank Request.

**MOTION: Stan Plewe moved to approve the FY2021 State Funded Capital Development Prioritization and to move the Land Banking Request from Dixie State University forward to the Legislature.**

DFCM Research Consultant Jake Njord introduced himself and requested agencies and institutions contact him to contribute data for the Five Year Book which will be published for the Legislature in early 2020.

Jeff indicated that non-state funded projects will be heard in December. If there are enough items for the agenda, the Board could possibly have a November Meeting.

Chair Burgess asked for a motion to adjourn.

**□ ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Kevin VanTassell moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Lisa Barrager and passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 am.